

**FARMINGTON CITY**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
September 17, 2015

---

**STUDY SESSION**

***Present:** Chair Rebecca Wayment, Commissioners Brett Anderson, Alex Leeman, Bret Gallacher, and Dan Rogers, Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson, and Recording Secretary Melanie Monson.*

Heather Barnum and Kent Hickley were excused from the meeting.

**Chair Rebecca Wayment** asked if there were any changes to the minutes from September 3, 2015, and there were none.

**Item #3. Jeffrey Johnson – Requesting Approval for a Metes and Bounds Subdivision**

**Eric Anderson** said this item is a simple lot split. There is an existing home on the property, which will be on one lot. In order for the existing home to meet the side setback requirements, the second lot can only be 75 feet wide. **Eric** said the zoning administrator will approve the deviation at building permit. He said the request is pretty straightforward and meets all the requirements with the exception of the width. **Dave Petersen** said they are 200 foot deep lots. The City will vacate a portion of its right of way along 600 North along the length of the property.

**Item #4. Scott Harwood/The Haws Companies – Requesting Preliminary Plat Approval for the Park Lane Commons Phase III Subdivision**

**Eric Anderson** explained that this item is straightforward. Some information regarding the easements has been cleaned up, and included as conditions to be met before final plat. Staff recommends approval. **Dan Rogers** asked what will happen to the parcel marked for wetlands. **Eric Anderson** said the lot will sit there until they want to develop it, at which point they will have to do a plat amendment to make it a buildable lot.

**Item #5. Phil Holland/Wright Development – Requesting Preliminary Plat Approval and Final Plat Approval for the East Park Lane Subdivision**

**Eric Anderson** said preliminary and final plat are being held jointly since this is a 2 lot subdivision. They are extending Lagoon Drive. Because they will be dedicating the right of way for Lagoon Drive, it is a major instead of a minor subdivision. The infrastructure and improvements are being completed jointly with the Mercedes-Benz dealership, and everyone who has looked it over has given it a green light.

**Item #6. Brad Knowlton/Ascent Construction – Requesting Approval for Conditional Use Related to a New Office Building**

**Dave Petersen** said this item was tabled for the 5 reasons listed in the packet. The City attorney said that deference regarding the requirements for the landscaped buffer and fence will be given to the Planning Commission. The attorney advised they be careful with how they administer it. He said the City has never required 30' for a side setback for an office building. He said to the best of his knowledge, if there was a residential use right next to a very intense retail commercial use, he could see the merit of requiring the 30' setback, given the higher intensity of the use. Whereas this is an office building that is only open 5 days per week, 9-5 pm, that requirement does not make sense. He said Planning Commissions in the past have not typically required the full 30 feet, but have used the requirement in Chapter 14, which is 10 feet. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if there are any examples of office buildings next to residential uses that have narrow setbacks. **Dave Petersen** said the City does have some examples, but not very many in the BP zone. There is the Lagoon office building, which abuts several homes, and has very narrow setbacks of 4 or 5 feet. He also said the library parking lot is right next to a home, but it is in the BR zone. The parking lot for Farmington Junior High is right next to a home, but is also in a different zone. He said there are several examples where rear yards abut residential. Based on the relatively low intensity of an office use, he thinks 10 feet is fair, based on what the City has done with other uses. **Dave Petersen** said he met with the applicant several times before they removed the mature trees along the property line, which created a natural buffer, and he is disappointed they were removed. He said staff believes if the Planning Commission requires the fence and the 10 foot setbacks from Chapter 14, a challenge may be unlikely. **Bret Gallacher** asked if the City attorney had an opinion on requiring less than the 30' buffer stated in Chapter 7. **Dave Petersen** said that the City attorney indicated the City could require less than a 30' buffer, if it is reasonable. He said the applicant has pushed this building as far front as they are comfortable with, and it is still close to the sidewalk. **Dave Petersen** reviewed the 5 items identified at the previous Planning Commission meeting as needing to be addressed. **Dan Rogers** asked if the applicant is willing to put in an 8 foot fence. **Alex Leeman** expressed that the Planning Commission could require it. **Bret Gallacher** said the applicant volunteered to install an 8 foot fence. **Dave Petersen** said side and rear yard fences can be up to 8 feet, however the code for the BP zone only requires 6 foot fences. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if there is any code requirement to install an 8 foot fence if there is a terrain difference. She cited an example with the Maverick Gas Station on Shepherd Lane, where the houses are lower than the gas station and an 8 foot fence was installed. **Dave Petersen** said the property owner is planning to bring in a lot of fill, and his property may end up being higher. He said if that is the case, it will end up looking like a 7 foot fence on the residential side. **Dan Rogers** expressed a desire to clarify that point with the applicant.

**Dave Petersen** requested that item 6 be moved up to the first item on the agenda because he needed to leave for another meeting.

---

## **REGULAR SESSION**

***Present:** Chair Rebecca Wayment, Commissioners Brett Anderson, Bret Gallacher, Alex Leeman, and Dan Rogers, Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson and Recording Secretary Melanie Monson.*

Heather Barnum and Kent Hinckley were excused from the meeting.

## **Item #1. Minutes**

**Dan Rogers** made a motion to approve the Minutes from the September 3, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. **Alex Leeman** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**Item #2. City Council Report**

**Eric Anderson** gave a report from the September 15, 2015 City Council meeting. He said the first item was the May PUD subdivision, which the City Council approved with the setbacks the applicant requested. The second item was the Plat Amendment for Farmington Creek Estates, which was also approved.

**CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION**

**Note: Item Was Moved Up in the Agenda**

**Item #6. Brad Knowlton/Ascent Construction (Note: this item was tabled at September 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting) – Applicant is requesting approval for a conditional use related to a new office building located at the northwest corner of Park Lane and Main in a BP (Business Park) zone. (C-9-15)**

**Dave Petersen** said this item was tabled at the last Planning Commission meeting in order to address the 5 issues set forth in the report. 1: review by the City attorney- he said deference to administration of the City's ordinances regarding the requirement for a wall and/or a 30 foot setback will go to the Planning Commission, and not to the applicant, as long as the requirements follow precedent and are reasonable. To his knowledge, the City has not required a 30 foot setback on a side yard. Chapter 7 for the commercial zone requires 30 foot setbacks, a fence, or both; Chapter 14 for the BP zone requires 10 feet. He said a bigger buffer would make sense for a more intense use such as a gas station. He thinks 10 feet is reasonable and appropriate. In Chapter 14, it indicates that a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees need to be planted at a rate of 1 tree for every 300 square feet of landscape area. For conditional uses, the Planning Commission may require additional trees as a buffer. He said Lagoon has a strip of trees between their parking lot and the frontage road, which has turned into an extensive buffer. If the Planning Commission gives staff the leeway, they will require lots of landscaping to create a green buffer. He said it is unfortunate that the applicant removed many of the mature trees within their 10 foot buffer. The Planning Commission can dictate the width/caliper of trees to be planted.

**Dave Petersen** addressed item 2 regarding the expansion of Park Lane. He said the expansion will take place immediately because they have to expand the road in order to get a building permit. Item 3 addressed consulting with UDOT and discussing hardship negotiations for the Heiner home. He said they clarified that UDOT wants a 22 extra feet of right of way, which is included on the site plan. He said they are prepared to take out the Heiner home, and to find the funding for them to have it removed. Item 4 was to gain clarification on the 20' or 24' requirement for emergency access on Main Street. He said the zoning ordinance for such driveways is 24'. He said the applicant shows 26'. The final item was to address requirements for loading and unloading, which he said staff felt was not necessary. This will allow them to keep 3-4 parking spaces and will result in no net loss in parking due to the UDOT right of way.

He said referring to the list that there are 3 important conditions that deal with the Planning Commission: the 6 foot fence and 10 foot buffer, the setbacks on Park Lane and the setbacks on Main Street. The applicant shows the Park Lane setbacks as 13', which staff recommends approving. Items 4 and 5 are self-explanatory. He said they are showing Farmington Rock to address item 6. He said item 7 is up to the Planning Commission; he does not care if they want to see any of these elements come back to the Planning Commission. The most important items are 1-3, which determine where the building will

be. **Eric Anderson** said on condition 3, it says 15 feet, but on the plan it says 13 feet, so he requested the Planning Commission change the motion accordingly.

**Brett Anderson** clarified that the setbacks deal with the location of the building, and that buffers are something entirely different. **Dave Petersen** said a buffer can be in a setback area. **Brett Anderson** clarified that what we are talking about is an extra buffer that separates the northern parcel from the parking lot, which **Dave Petersen** confirmed and said would be located within the side or rear setback area. **Brett Anderson** referenced Chapter 14, and clarified that it references setbacks and not buffers, which Dave also confirmed. **Dave Petersen** said the authority for the buffer comes from 11-14-050, paragraphs 1 and 2, which says parking lots shall not be permitted within the minimum required setback, but the Planning Commission can modify the setback requirement; it also says that if parking is in the rear, a landscaping strip of at least 10 feet shall be maintained along the property line. He said it is included as the last sentence before the suggested motion.

**Bob Murri**, 513 Graystone Farmington, Utah. He said they met with UDOT as well as with the City, and feel that the 10 foot setback on the north side meets the requirements. **Dan Rogers** said they had expressed willingness to install a higher fence for the neighboring property owner, and asked if they will make the fence on the property owner's level. **Bob Murri** said the requirement is for a 6 foot fence, which is what they are willing to put in, and asked if there is a need for an 8 foot fence. **Dan Rogers** said they will need to see if the neighbor wants one. He said they are feeling sympathetic due to the loss of trees. **Bob Murri** said they were not the kind of good trees they wanted on the property. **Alex Leeman** said they cannot make an 8 foot fence a condition of approval, since a 6 foot fence is the ordinance. **Bob Murri** said they were planning to match the existing fence. **Brett Anderson** asked if the neighbor has expressed any preference about the height of the fence. **Bob Murri** said he has not discussed the fence with the neighbor, but believes an 8 foot fence would feel confining.

**Rebecca Wayment** pointed out that the intersection of Park Lane and Main Street is a gateway to the City and wondered about the façade of the building as it faces this corridor. **Bob Murri** said it will have glass walls, ceramic tile, rock, etc. He said it will look very professional. He said there will be a tall pillar that can be seen from both the north and south sides.

**Bret Gallacher** said because he was gone for the last meeting, he is assuming everything the Planning Commission asked the applicant to address or do, they have answered and taken care of. **Brett Anderson** said most questions from the previous meeting were directed to staff. He said the members of the Planning Commission were discussing whether they could require a 30 foot setback. **Bret Gallacher** asked if the Planning Commission feels comfortable the 10 foot setback, which was confirmed. **Dan Rogers** said there is some leeway to describe what needs to go into that buffer area. **Bret Gallacher** said he feels badly for the landowner who lost those mature trees, but **Alex Leeman** confirmed that it is the landowner's prerogative to remove those trees. **Dan Rogers** suggested that they require the trees to be denser than the stated requirement. **Alex Leeman** said based on the statute, it would be 1 tree every 30 feet. **Rebecca Wayment** said there are not a lot of office buildings in the City that abut residential areas, and requiring a buffer to shield the residents will help to make it as nice as possible. **Bret Gallacher** said he thinks the decision to require more landscaping in the buffer area should make sense and not be out of spite. **Bob Murri** pointed out that there is no buffer between the library and the residents next door to it, and he hopes for consistency in the City with regard to the buffer landscaping requirements. **Rebecca Wayment** pointed out that the library is in a different zone, and said that example was discussed during the study session. **Bob Murri** also said there is property to the north of the office development that is currently for sale as commercial property, and **Alex Leeman** clarified that the City wants to keep the property along Main Street zoned as Large Residential, but that properties to the north and west of the office building will likely become commercial developments.

**Alex Leeman** said the buffer strip is 140 feet long, and 10 feet wide, which would mean they would be required to plant 4-5 trees based on the ordinance. He asked if they wanted to delegate it to

staff or to make the decision now. **Bob Murri** said there are 6 trees currently on the plan. **Alex Leeman** read what the ordinance specifies. **Eric Anderson** said 30 feet off center is standard, and suggested a conifer would be a good tree because they make better screens. **Bret Gallacher** asked if they wanted to change the motion. **Alex Leeman** suggested putting in a higher density requirement, and then leaving the types of trees to the landowner's discretion. **Brett Anderson** and **Rebecca Wayment** both expressed that they feel inadequate to determine a proper density. **Dan Rogers** said that it seems like the Planning Commission would like it to be dense and as beautiful as possible, and said they should leave it to staff to specify. **Eric Anderson** said the ordinance does not specify shrubs, only trees. He thinks the ordinance is reasonable. **Brett Anderson** suggested adding up to 1 tree every 300 square feet, and leaving it to staff to determine what will work best within a range. **Rebecca Wayment** said the additional condition number 7 says the applicant can provide a landscaping plan that can come back for review, which the Planning Commission can approve or ask for additional items. **Alex Leeman** said that if they cannot figure out how to quantify the density they want, they should just leave it to the code. **Bret Gallacher** said it would be nice if they did not have to come back before the Planning Commission. **Brett Anderson** said he agrees with Alex and feels uneasy about being arbitrary. The applicant said the landscaping plan is included, and they have 7 trees, which exceeds the requirement, and there are shrubs as well. **Dan Rogers** asked if the fact that they are losing some parking stalls will change the landscaping plan. The applicant said it will change a little bit. **Alex Leeman** said the homeowner can always plant trees on her side of the fence. **Bret Gallacher** wondered if they could approve the motion according to code, but include some leeway for staff. **Brett Anderson** said it authorizes the Planning Commission to require more trees, but not to delegate it to staff. **Rebecca Wayment** asked Eric if this is a site plan, or preliminary. **Eric Anderson** said it is site plan, and that with a conditional use/site plan they just have one shot. **Brett Anderson** said he does not see the ability to delegate it to staff within the code. **Bret Gallacher** said it is written in condition 7. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if they should strike condition 7. **Alex Leeman** said it does not need to be stricken, because they can delegate the entire approval, but they cannot add an additional delegation asking staff to determine how many trees to put in. He said when the buffer increases to 10 feet, the plan will look different. He said they have the power to require more trees, not suggest them, so they need to make sure whatever they require will work. **Rebecca Wayment** said seeing 7 trees on a 5 foot buffer, she would suggest doubling what they see for the 10 foot buffer. The applicant said when the trees are mature they will be 25 feet in diameter. **Brett Anderson** said you do not want the trees to encroach on the neighboring property. **Eric Anderson** said the point is to get the center of the trees as far on the property as possible. **Brett Anderson** said there were 5-6 trees before they were cut down, and they are putting in 5-6 trees, so it will be pretty comparable. **Eric Anderson** said most plans show 75% of tree maturity, and ultimately planting more will not make a big difference. He thinks what the plan shows is reasonable. **Alex Leeman** said his vote is to require what is in subsection 4. **Eric Anderson** said as part of their building permit and inspections, they look at the landscape plan. If they delegate it to staff, staff will take care of the final approval. **Alex Leeman** said that needs to happen because the current plan does not match the proposed site plan. **Rebecca Wayment** said she is comfortable delegating it to staff and having them review it and giving them the option to require more. **Alex Leeman** said if they have the authority to delegate final approval to staff he is fine with that, but he is not comfortable delegating the density requirements to staff because he does not think they have that authority.

**Motion:**

**Bret Gallacher** made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the proposed conditional use subject to all applicable City codes, development standards and ordinances and the following conditions:



1. The applicant shall provide a 6' high masonry fence (or an accepted alternative fence as approved by the Planning Commission) and provide a 10' landscaped buffer between the parking lot and the north property line;
2. The Planning Commission shall reduce the required setback on Main Street from 30' to 20' as set forth in Section 11-14-050(1) of the Zoning Ordinance;
3. The Planning Commission shall reduce the required setback on Park Lane from 30' to 13' as set forth in Section 11-14-050(1) of the Zoning Ordinance.

With the additional conditions as follows:

4. The Farmington City Sign Ordinance shall be followed for all signs throughout the site;
5. Outdoor lighting, if used, must be subdued. All lighting shall be designed, located and directed to minimize glare, reflection and light pollution into adjoining and nearby lots;
6. An element of "Farmington Rock" shall be included in part of the exterior façade of the building OR as architectural elements in the landscape and be approved by the City Planning Department;
7. The site plan related to this application shall be deferred to staff and the DRC for final approvals, including all improvement drawings.

**Dan Rogers** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**Dan Rogers:** Aye

**Bret Gallacher:** Aye

**Brett Anderson:** aye

**Alex Leeman:** Aye

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposed use of the particular location is necessary and desirable and provides a service which contributes to the general well-being of the community. The Ascent Construction Building is a great asset to the community and provides more space for local businesses here in the county;
2. The proposed use complies with all regulations and conditions in the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance for this particular use, as it is a professional office building;
3. The proposed use conforms to the goals, policies, and principles of the Comprehensive General Plan;
4. The proposed use is compatible with the character of the site, adjacent properties, surrounding neighborhoods and other existing development as it will be a much needed upgrade to the facilities that are currently existing in the area, and the required 10' landscape buffer along with a 6' high fence will provide an adequate and reasonable buffer between the proposed development and the abutting DeJong property to the north;
5. The location provide or will provide adequate utilities, transportation access, drainage, parking and loading space, lighting, screening, landscaping and open space, fire protection and safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular circulation;
6. The proposed use is not detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity and does not cause:
  - a. Unreasonable risks to the safety of persons or property because of vehicular traffic or parking;
  - b. Unreasonable risks to the safety of persons or property because of vehicular traffic or parking;
  - c. Unreasonable interference with the lawful use of surrounding property; and

- d. A need for essential municipal services which cannot be reasonably met.

## SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

**Item #4. Jeffrey Johnson (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting approval for a metes and bounds subdivision consisting of 2 lots on .76 acres located at 54 East 600 North in an OTR (Original Townsite Residential) zone. (S-33-15)**

**Eric Anderson** said the proposed subdivision is on 600 North and Main Street. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the lot. The proposed metes and bounds subdivision would comply with all ordinances, with the exception of the width. As long as the 5 criteria are met, the zoning administrator can allow it. Thus far, 3 conditions are met, and the other 2 will be met. Staff is recommending approval.

**Jeffrey Johnson**, 54 East 600 North, Farmington Utah. He said he purchased the current lot and is looking to build on the proposed second lot. **Eric Anderson** said the two lots were combined in 2006, and his proposal is going back to the original. He said once split they will be the 2 of the largest lots in the neighborhood. He said the existing home will stay.

**Rebecca Wayment opened the Public Hearing at 8:12 p.m.**

No comments were received.

**Rebecca Wayment closed the Public Hearing at 8:12 p.m.**

**Brett Anderson** said the lots meet the standards, and the fact that it is going back to the original lot configuration, makes him comfortable with it.

### ***Motion:***

**Brett Anderson** made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the Dry Well Estates Metes and Bounds Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City codes, ordinances, and development standards. **Alex Leeman** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

### **Findings for Approval:**

1. This application is for a simple lot split, and the two lots created would conform to all requirements in the OTR zone.
2. The lot sizes created by this metes and bounds subdivision meet or exceed the surrounding neighborhood.
3. The requested subdivision meets all of the standards as set forth in Section 12-4-020 of the Subdivision Ordinance regarding when metes and bounds subdivision are permitted.

**Item #5. Scott Harwood/The Haws Companies – Applicant is requesting plat approval for the Park Lane Commons Phase III Subdivision consisting of 3 lots on 9.77 acres located at approximately Market Street & Station Parkway in a GMU (General Mixed Use) zone. (S-16-15)**

**Eric Anderson** said this is on Station Parkway north of where the Cabela's is going in. The proposal is to create 3 lots, and to leave 1 parcel which will remain as wetlands. Lot 303 is where the assisted living facility is proposed to go, and the other 2 lots are on Station Parkway. Staff recommends approval. **Dan Rogers** asked what is going in across the street. **Eric Anderson** said it was Park Lane Commons Phase I, and the only thing going in right now is the McDonald's. **Eric** said the suggested motion takes care of the right of way and easement issues.

**Scott Harwood**, 33 South Shadow Breeze Road, Kaysville, Utah. He said they are fine with both of the easements, but he asked about the trail easement behind Parcel A. He said they hope to mitigate the wetlands area and to develop it in the future. He asked if the trail will go in now, or if it is an extension agreement before final plat. **Eric Anderson** said yes, it would either be before final plat or before recordation. He asked if it is simply an agreement between the City and the developer that the trail will be going in at some point. **Eric** confirmed that it will go in once development happens. **Scott Harwood** asked regarding condition 6, if they can include vertical improvements as a note on the plat to specify what the no-build easement includes. **Eric Anderson** said yes, the City is fine with that.

***Motion:***

**Dan Rogers** made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary plat for the Park Lane Commons Phase III, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards, and the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide an approved wetland delineation prior to or concurrent with final plat approval;
2. The applicant shall obtain all necessary secondary water shares from Weber Basin prior to consideration of final plat;
3. The applicant shall dedicate 16.5' of public right-of-way on the south boundary of their property on final plat;
4. The applicant shall enter into an agreement to ensure that future improvements and the future street will be built in its ultimate location at that time that the Evans family develops;
5. The applicant shall provide a trail easement along those portions of his property that abut Shepard Creek, and install a trail, and/or enter into an extension agreement for the trail before final plat or recordation;
6. Along the west side of the property, the applicant shall provide a no-build easement with a note on the plat that refers to no building vertically to delineate the block face; and an easement shall be provided for public safety and pedestrian access, as well as maintenance vehicles.

**Alex Leeman** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**Findings for Approval:**

1. The proposed subdivision conforms to all of the development standards as set forth in the Farmington City Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances.



2. The proposed preliminary plat creates a needed east-west connection from Station Parkway to points west, and conforms to the Regulating Plan and that plan's stated purpose of creating connectivity throughout the Mixed Use District.
3. Parcel A will preserve wetlands, and the portions of those properties that abut Shepard Creek will be preserved as open space, and a trail easement will be provided.
4. The applicant has performed a geotech report above and beyond the normal requirements as a way to address the soil issues.
5. The subdivision of this property will allow for Western States Assisted Living to develop, which is a good use in this location, and fills a need the City has to care for and house their elderly residents.
6. Lots 301 and 302 will be developed as part of the Park Lane Commons project master plan, and although we do not know what uses will be proposed there yet, when those applications do come, staff will review and approve them as part of the review process set forth in the development agreement with The Haws Company.

**Item #6. Phil Holland/Wright Development – Applicant is requesting a preliminary plat approval and final plat approval for the East Park Lane Subdivision consisting of 2 lots on 4 acres of property located at approximately 425 West and 700 North in an LS (Large Suburban) and A (Agriculture) zone. (S-24-15)**

**Eric Anderson** showed the property just past the Chevron gas station, extending Lagoon Drive. He said the area was rezoned as part of the Mercedes-Benz dealership, conditional upon whether a site plan is approved for each of these lots. This is a major subdivision because of the Lagoon Drive extension. The DRC has reviewed it and given their sign off, with a condition to reflect their concern. Staff recommends approval.

**Dan Rogers** clarified that this is just approving the subdivision. **Eric Anderson** said they will have to come back to get approval for the uses and then the rezoning will take effect.

***Motion for Preliminary Plat:***

**Alex Leeman** made a motion that the Planning Commission approve preliminary plat for the East Park Lane Subdivision, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards, and the following conditions;

1. The applicant shall address all outstanding DRC comments prior to recordation;
2. The applicant shall dedicate 66' of public right-of-way on the east boundary of the proposed subdivision on Final Plat;
3. For any sewer lines not installed in a roadway, the applicant shall dedicate a 30' easement in favor of Central Davis Sewer District; and such dedication shall be on the recorded plat.

**Bret Gallacher** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**Findings for Approval:**

1. The proposed subdivision conforms to all of the development standards as set forth in the Farmington City Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances.

2. The proposed plat begins a needed and planned north-south connection from Park Lane to points north, and conforms to the Master Transportation Plan and the plan's stated purpose of creating connectivity throughout the City.
3. The subdivision of this property will allow for future development, and though it is not directly a part of the proposed Mercedes Benz dealership, it will be the continuation of this type of development which fits the CMU zone and is consistent with the master plan for this area.
4. The proposed road alignment will continue Lagoon Drive and will allow for future development of the road without being impeded by the wetland complex.

***Motion for Final Plat:***

**Alex Leeman** made a motion that the Planning Commission approve final plat for the East Park Lane Subdivision, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards, with the same conditions and findings as those listed above for preliminary plat approval (in Motion A). **Bret Gallacher** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***Motion:***

At 8:29 p.m., **Bret Gallacher** made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was unanimously approved.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Rebecca Wayment**  
**Chair, Farmington City Planning Commission**